

REMARKS

Claims 1-57 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 10, 16, 25, 36, and 42 have been amended and claims 50-57 have been added.

Summary of Telephone Interview

Applicant wishes to thank Examiners Hotaling and Hall for the courtesies extended during the personal interview on December 11, 2007. The participants also included Applicant's representatives, Sorin Cimpoes and the Jeremie Moll. Proposed amendments to independent claims 1, 10, 16, 25, and 36 were submitted on December 7, 2007 with Applicant's Interview Request Form. Independent claims 1, 10, 16, 25, and 36 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Pat. No. 6,146,273 to Olsen ("Olsen"). According to the Interview Summary dated December 11, 2007, the Examiners "agreed that continuously updating a pay table during display is a feature that does not appear to be disclosed in Olsen." Independent claims 1, 10, 16, 25, and 36 have been amended to include this limitation.

Drawings

The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 C.F.R. 1.84(p)(5) because they do not include reference signs provided in the description, namely "65a-65d" described on page 9, lines 16-18 and "70a-70d" as described on page 10, lines 11-14. In full response to the Office Action, a corrected drawing of FIG. 4 including the reference numerals has been provided in the attached Replacement Sheet in compliance with 37 C.F.R. 1.121(d). As required by the Examiner, an Annotated Sheet, is also provided. The corrections find support on page 9, lines 16-18, which refers to the upper four winning outcomes in the gaming terminals 10a-10d with corresponding reference numbers 65a-65d. In addition, page 10, lines 11-14 state that "FIG. 4 also illustrates the concept of having a real-time clock 70a-70d on each of the gaming terminals 10a-10d. . . ." Therefore, withdrawal of the objection to the drawings is in order and is respectfully requested.

Claim Objections

Claims 1 and 42 are objected to due to informalities. In particular, the Examiner suggests that the term "and" be added between the "input device" element and the "at least

one display” element. The Examiner also suggests removal of the term “and” before the “wherein” clause. Claims 1 and 42 have been amended according to the Examiner’s suggestions. Therefore, withdrawal of the objection to the claims is in order and is respectfully requested.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-7, 9-14, 16-18, 25, 27, 30-33, 36-44, and 47-49 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Olsen. As discussed above, independent claims 1, 10, 16, 25, and 36 have been amended to include the limitation of updating a pay table during display. In particular, claim 1 has been amended to recite that “said pay table is displayed as said pay table is being continuously updated. Claim 10 has been amended to recite “said payout amount being continuously displayed as said payout amount is being increased.” Claim 16 has been amended to recite “said pay table being continuously displayed as said payout amounts are being updated.” Claim 25 has been amended to recite “said payout amounts being continuously displayed as said payout amounts are being increased.” Claim 36 has been amended to recite “said payout amounts associated with each of said plurality of winning outcomes being continuously displayed as said payout amounts are being increased” and “said payout amounts associated with the other of said plurality of winning outcomes being continuously displayed as said payout amounts are being increased.”

As also discussed above, the Examiners have “agreed that continuously updating a pay table during display is a feature that does not appear to be disclosed in Olsen.” (*See* Interview Summary dated December 11, 2007.) In particular, the payout scheme of Olsen is not known to the players. For example, Olsen teaches the use of a random payout selector 292 that randomly selects the payout, and an indicator 320 that is activated to inform a player of the payout amount after the player has won. (*See* Olsen, col. 16, line 65-col. 17, line 24; col. 17, lines 52-55.) Therefore, Olsen fails to teach or suggest each and every element recited by independent claims 1, 10, 16, 25, and 36. Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1, 10, 16, 25, and 36 is in order and is respectfully requested. In addition, dependent claims 2-7, 9, 11-14, 17-18, 27, 30-33, 37-41 are also allowable at least for the same reasons as base claims 1, 10, 16, 25, and 36.

In addition, independent claim 42 recites that “a first group of said plurality of winning outcomes is continuously updated in response to portions of wager inputs received at a first collection of said plurality of linked gaming terminals, and a second group of said plurality of winning outcomes is continuously updated in response to portions of wager

inputs received from a second collection of said plurality of linked gaming terminals.” Olsen fails to teach or suggest continuously updating one group of winning outcomes on a display according to a first group of terminals and updating a second group of winning outcomes on the same display according to a second group of terminals. Rather, Olsen merely discloses creating a single jackpot bonus pool from a single group of linked gaming machines. (*See, e.g.,* col. 3, line 50-col. 4, line 8.) Accordingly, Olsen fails to teach each and or suggest each and every element recited by independent claim 42. Withdrawal of the rejection of claim 42 is in order and is respectfully requested. In addition, dependent claims 44 and 47-49 are also allowable at least for the same reasons as base claim 42.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 8, 15, 19-24, 26, 28-29, 34-35, and 45-46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being unpatentable over Olsen in view of U.S. Pat. No. 5,851,149 to Xidos et al. Dependent claims 8, 15, 19-24, 26, 28-29, 34-35, and 45-46 are also allowable at least for the same reasons as base claims 1, 10, 16, 25, 36, and 42. Therefore, withdrawal of this rejection is in order and is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

It is the Applicant’s belief that all the pending claims are now in condition for allowance, and thus reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested. If there are any matters which may be resolved or clarified through a telephone interview, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned attorney at the number indicated. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees required or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 50-4181 for the above identified docket number.

Dated: February 4, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

By William D. PEGG, Reg. #42,988/

William D. Pegg

Registration No.: 42,988

NIXON PEABODY LLP

161 N. Clark St., 48th Floor

Chicago, Illinois 60601

(312) 425-3900

Attorneys For Applicant